



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/730,801 12/08/2003 Tadahisa Saga 00597/0200575-US0 2725 EXAMINER 01/19/2005 7278 7590 DARBY & DARBY P.C. NORMAN, MARC E P. O. BOX 5257 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257 3744

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Office Action Occurs  | 10/730,801   | SAGA ET AL.  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |
|   | Marc E. Norman   | 3744   |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for R ply  | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |
| Status  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 De  | ecember 2003.  |  |  |
|   | action is non-final.   | •  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E  | ·  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |  |  |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 7-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-6 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  | vn from consideration.   |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine  | r.   |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 December 2003</u> is/a  Applicant may not request that any objection to the  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object<br>drawing(s) be held in abeyance See<br>ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |
| a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list  | s have been received.<br>s have been received in Applicati<br>rity documents have been receive<br>u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No ed in this National Stage  |  |
| Attachment(s)   | <b>∆</b> □   | (DTO 412)  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | . 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da   |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | <del></del>  | atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/730,801

Art Unit: 3744

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanyo Electric (JP 07308183 A) in view of Prows et al.

As per claims 1 and 7-10, Sanyo Electric teaches all aspects of the claims (see Figure 2) except a cover/display panel/operation section that is attached to the incubator body so that an angle to the incubator body is adjustable. Prows et al. teaches the concept of an incubator control panel that is angularly adjustable with regard to the incubator body (see column 2, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply this basic concept to the incubator of Sanyo Electric for the purpose user convenience or to reduce glare on the read out screen (Prows et al., column 2, lines 4-5),

Art Unit: 3744

particularly since both references are directed to incubator systems and since the concept of adjustable panels has broad applicability for convenience in controlling a broad array of equipment.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 571-272-4808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/730,801

Art Unit: 3744

MN

MARC NORMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER